

# TOWN MEETING



July 10, 1955  
Vol. 21, No. 11  
878th Broadcast

## "WHERE DO WE STAND ON CIVIL DEFENSE?"

### *Speakers:*

VAL PETERSON

REP. DANIEL J. FLOOD

MAYOR AUGUST WALZ

### *Moderator:*

GUNNAR BACK



Broadcast from  
Station WMAL  
Washington, D. C.

**BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR**

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time



## "WHERE DO WE STAND ON CIVIL DEFENSE?"

**MR. BACK:** On June 15th, we had Operation Alert, the first countrywide test of how things would go if an enemy reached us by air and dropped a big and terrible bomb on fifty or so of our big cities and other key targets. On paper, that massive attack killed well over 8 million Americans, injured  $6\frac{1}{2}$  million and left an estimated 24 million people homeless. If it had been a real attack, what a frightful month this last one would have been for all of us.

Federal Civil Defense Administrator, Val Peterson, needs very little further identification from me. He was three times Republican Governor of the State of Nebraska. He served as an Air Force Officer in World War II, as an officer in the Reserve. He has been Federal Civil Defense Director since the Eisenhower Administration began. He is an old friend of mine in discussions like this, on the subject: "WHERE DO WE STAND ON CIVIL DEFENSE?" TOWN MEETING welcomes Governor Val Peterson.

**GOV. PETERSON:** Now I think, first of all, we should bear in mind that when we're dealing with civil defense, we're dealing with an utterly new concept in the world, and in one of the toughest areas that anyone has ever had to face. When you deal with weapons of the size of, let us say, 20 million tons of TNT explosive force, which may be relatively small in the event of World War III, a weapon which can destroy everything -- obliterate everything within a diameter of ten miles, creating a crater 200 feet deep and a mile and a half or more across -- when you're dealing with weapons of this kind, you're dealing with a problem that, I think it is not an overstatement to say, is the toughest problem that the world has ever faced. As a matter of fact, what this world needs desperately tonight and in the future is peace, rather than war.

But it takes two to make peace, and we alone cannot control it, so we must be prepared -- militarily and every other way.

Now there are two broad phases in civil defense. There is the post-attack phase, the remedial phase or the cleanup phase -- what you do after the attack has taken place. In this phase we have copied our procedures after the experience of the British and the Germans, and those two people know more about civil defense and about modern warfare and bombing than any other two people in the world, at first-hand. We think we've made some improvements and the British have been kind enough to so suggest, and every state and every American territory and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico does have a civil defense of this type. Some of them are good, some of them are poor and some of them are in-between. We should never lose sight of the fact that thousands of fine patriotic self-sacrificing Americans have served their country very well in the development of this post-attack phase, which is made up of such things as the auxiliary police forces, fire departments, rescue squads, the welfare people who do mass feeding and the sheltering of the public, of communications people, of transportation people, of the block wardens and of the medical services. These people have served their country and are serving their country well.

The phase that I am somewhat more interested in is the pre-attack phase, because here we have an opportunity to save millions of lives. In the pre-attack, civil defense has absolutely nothing to work with, except space and shelter, and you gain space by evacuation, by moving away from the point of the detonation of the bomb on the surface of the earth. And I have discussed this matter with every scientist and every military figure that I have been able to, all over the world, and I know of no one who has been able to come up with an alternative to evacuation that is sound and acceptable. But we must balance evacuation with shelter.

We have tried to stress to the American people that anyone who lives 11 or 12 or more miles from an assumed aiming point can do nothing better for himself and his family at this very hour than to build a backyard shelter that will permit him to get 3 feet of dirt over his head, because that will give him absolute protection against the effects

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.



of radioactive fallout -- it will give him absolute protection against the thermal effect or fire effect of the bomb, and if he pours a little concrete into it and reinforces it with steel, it will give him tremendous effect against the blast effect of the bomb.

But there is no safeguard against the detonation of a megaton weapon if you are within that radius or diameter of total obliteration. If you're there, you're going to be dead after the bomb goes off and I know of no way that you can contravene that. All of the evidence that we have so far in the United States with respect to evacuation indicates that evacuation will work. Fifteen or more cities have run evacuations as big as the one in Mobile that involved 49,000 people who moved out of a 480 Square block area in Mobile by automobiles, moving a few miles to the edge of the city. They did it in 19 minutes -- 49,000 people -- and they didn't scratch one fender. When a man says that evacuation won't work, he's usually relying on his own experience which is limited, and he's overlooking the fact that we'll have one way traffic and controlled traffic and people will know where they are going and it will have been tried.

Now, there is one very important phase of this whole problem of civil defense that needs discussion tonight and probably we'll have it. The law which was written in 1950 and which I think was a good law and is still in the main a very fine law, says that civil defense is primarily the responsibility of the states and the localities. That law was written during the time of the blockbusters, at the time when we had just the detonation of two atomic weapons of very small size. Now we have a situation where in the great city of Philadelphia, if you detonate a large weapon, in the million ton class, the fire and the blast effect alone will involve parts of three states, eleven counties and thirty-nine municipalities of over ten thousand people. Today this law will have to be changed. This law must be changed in the future, soundly and after careful deliberation, must be changed in my judgment to provide that civil defense shall be primarily -- if it's to be primarily the responsibility of anyone -- of the federal government, with strong support from the states and localities. In other words, it must be a joint enterprise.

**MR. BACK:** Representative Daniel Flood, a Democrat from Pennsylvania, is a member of the important House committee that votes money for civil defense. He is a fourth term in Congress, a lawyer by profession. So, for a Congressional view of where we stand on civil defense, here is Representative Daniel Flood!

**REP. FLOOD:** Of course, it should not be forgotten that it was Congress which passed the original Act creating civil defense. If it was not for this action of Congress, there would, of course, be no civil defense organization. Up until this time, the original Act stands and, as far as I know, no one identified with the executive branch of the government or the civil defense organization has ever requested that Congress amend that organic act. We have given them a total of \$320 million since 1952 for civil defense purposes. Congress has given civil defense this money and will give it more money; but under the planning and the programs presented, Congress has given more, in my opinion, than the organization needs. Hundreds of millions or billions of dollars alone will not solve this problem, any more than it will foreign aid or any more than it will any other kind of program. If Congress thought the appropriation of X billions of dollars would guarantee the safety of the American people on a civil defense program, Congress, as you know, would unhesitatingly appropriate the money. If "Sin" was the subject of this panel tonight, everybody would be against it. Now, civil defense is a program and everybody is for it. There will be no argument about that.

Civil defense actually, in our judgment, has no basic established plan. There have been many superficial presentations, much discussion, and many speeches and considerable literature; but it has been a hit and miss operation, so that Congress really has not been shown a concrete established program that we think will work effectively. More attention should be paid to continental defense plans. Of course, that is not actually civil defense; that's military, but I can't understand since we need that why these cuts in military appropriations should be made.

There is a federal problem, of course there is, in civil defense, as well as a local and state problem. Civil defense seems to have a lot of people scared to death.



Many people are not interested in civil defense because they have been so frightened they think all they are going to do is die anyway at the first enemy attack and what's the use of a program or worrying about it. Instead of frightening the people to death altogether, telling them very little, civil defense should present a planned program of education beyond what they've done -- stress how the individual must learn to take care of himself because survival of the fittest for each man is going to be the case here in many, many instances. The wrong state of mind, we think, now exists throughout the nation. Mr. Peterson himself is a member of the inter-governmental commission which just filed its report on these problems the other day. This commission recommended that nearly every phase of similar programs in the country be set back to the local or state level and yet, it said civilian defense, civil defense, should be almost exclusively the jurisdiction of the federal government.

There seems to be no plan having to do with H-bombs. We're talking about an A-bomb, we're talking about block-busters and so is this program. Now it's the President's job, the job of the administration, the job of the Civil Defense Administrator, to recommend to Congress a complete and well-justified program to deal with civil defense under the H-bomb era, under the inter-continental ballistic era. That's the program we want to listen to. This program, of course I agree, would be at federal level, should call for federal financing. This job can't be paid for by local or state governments; they can't afford it. Of course, the federal government can't either, but somebody has to pay. I guess it's us.

This plan must involve dispersion of industries and evacuation of populations. I'd like to see Mr. Peterson's job raised to Cabinet level -- he should be Secretary of the Civil Defense Department and this department must be prepared to coordinate, in case of enemy attack, with the national defense establishments when martial law is declared -- and make no mistake about it, martial law will be declared and then what? Civil defense must look ahead instead of behind in this Operation Alert to the day of guided missiles. Plans must be made for years ahead. Things we build physically must have dual purposes.

Criteria must be established so each area or each city can determine what its best policy is. Evacuation is not the sensible plan or the feasible plan for everyplace or everybody.

The present appropriations from Congress are ample to give federal leadership if the funds are properly spent on research, planning, public education, model laws and conveying to the people what they should do themselves. How can a city best determine its action -- its best action? There's a question. What about the public warning system? What have we got? Is it any good? What about radiological fall-out? What do you know about it? A year ago you didn't know anything about it. How are mass fires controlled? What good are fire engines with a mass fire? Anybody know? I doubt it very much. What will human behavior be in time of disaster if the military want to move down main highways with troops and artillery in that jam of civilians? You know what happened in Belgium and France. What about that? Will there be panic? Who's going to do anything about it?

Well, Mr. Chairman, chiefly civil defense should put its biggest effort into the development of a large technically trained planning staff which could conduct the operation studies, create believable understandable long-range programs and plans. That's what we should do.

MR. BACK: The city of Wilmington, Delaware, is heavily industrial, an important city of 230,000 people in its greater metropolitan area. August Walz, its young Republican mayor, is now half way through a four-year term. An athlete at the University of Delaware, a lawyer, Mr. Walz was a combat intelligence officer overseas in World War II and he continues in the reserves, a membership he began in college days. He was Wilmington's chief legal officer before he became mayor.

MAYOR WALZ: At home in Wilmington I have become a conscientious supporter of civil defense and do everything that I feel is justified to help it. But here in Washington, at this time, I wish to switch roles. I want to take this opportunity to make



a few criticisms, constructive criticisms, I hope, of civil defense. They are not necessarily my criticisms, although I think they are valid. They are criticisms I have heard from our citizens. They are, so to speak, criticisms from the grass-roots or, better still, from the sidewalk superintendents. I present them with the best of intentions, as a friend of civil defense, and I hope that they will help to clear the air on the vexed question of: "Where Do We Stand on Civil Defense?"

We sometimes get the feeling that the top echelon here in Washington is not in agreement on civil defense practice and policy. This confuses people which, in turn, leads to lack of public acceptance of civil defense. As an example of lack of policy coordination, there is the question of emergency transportation. So far as we in Wilmington have been able to determine, the question of control over transportation has never been settled. We don't know whether the military would have the right to requisition transportation in an emergency directly from private owners, or whether the military would be required to order it through civil defense. If policy matters like this -- and there are many others -- are not settled now, confusion will be compounded in an emergency.

Another criticism I bring from home is this: We often get the feeling that the military is not wholeheartedly supporting civil defense. It's hard to put your finger on specific instances, but that's the feeling. And when the idea gets around that the military regards civil defense lightly, how can we expect the general public to support it?

One more suggestion and then I'll stop. We feel that the federal government should come out with a practical, convincing, confidence-inspiring defense program. So often the emphasis, I feel, is on the horrors of nuclear war. If you scare people continually, they eventually get a hopeless feeling and then grow apathetic.

Take the much publicized problem of "fall-out." We have heard a great deal about the dangers of fall-out -- but the other side of the question -- what do we do effectively to protect ourselves from fall-out is much less emphasized.

I believe that in all matters of nuclear defense, the government should gather together all available up-to-the-minute scientific information on how to protect ourselves. Then, this mass of information should be reduced to a concrete program, a number of survival rules. And, finally, these survival rules should be spelled out to the public again and again. The stress should be on the fact that civil defense can save us -- or most of us -- if we learn our part in it. In short, I think we should put more emphasis on the positive in civil defense, and I think the lead should come from the federal government. When that is done, we won't have to worry about public acceptance.

But don't think I regard the picture as all black -- far from it. We in Wilmington are going ahead steadily with civil defense planning. Under the law, the Mayor of Wilmington is the Director of Civil Defense, with a full-time assistant. In areas where there is no conflict in policy, we have coordinated our municipal services, such as fire and police, to cope with a disaster, and we have expanded those services to some degree with civil defense volunteers. We have gone as far as we can with an evacuation plan. But, as I said, further development will come only when civil defense gains wider public acceptance. When that happens, we also will get more financial help from our City Council.

On the matter of financing, incidentally, I think it would help the local situation a great deal if the federal matching fund program were broadened to cover some administrative activities -- such as is now the case with the U. S. Health, Education, Welfare and other federal programs. But, in our city at least, wider public acceptance of civil defense will come only when the federal government takes a more forthright lead in formulating a positive, confidence-inspiring program which will rally enthusiasm.

It also will have to be a program with enough drive to carry us over the lulls in the cold war. Every time there is a relaxing of international tensions, interest in civil defense tends to cool off. But let's not kid ourselves. Civil defense is something we are going to need as far as we can see into the future, and the government should continually emphasize that point.



I realize, of course, that civil defense is merely in its infancy. There are bound to be differences of opinion. But I think we would be much farther along if policy differences were resolved at the top -- within the federal family -- once and for all so that we down in the ranks will know where we stand.

One thing I am sure we will all agree upon: Civil defense can mean the difference between national survival or chaos and defeat. Our real problem is how to team up and make it work.

MR. BACK: Governor Peterson, you just got about ten typewritten pages of solid advice and I know that you are very anxious to begin talking.

GOV. PETERSON: First, I would like to say that I have enjoyed hearing these discussions by the Congressman and the Mayor. I think many of the things they have said I could agree with wholeheartedly and I think in each case they made very fine statements. Some things that were said I don't believe I could accept. For example, you simply can't simplify the problems of the nuclear age or the problems that would be caused by nuclear attack. The military can't do it -- we can't do it -- the scientists can't do it -- nobody in the world can do it. The world has never seen anything of this type, anything of this magnitude, anything of the frightening aspects of a possible nuclear war. We have never tried to frighten anybody in civil defense, you don't have to try to frighten anybody. But, in my judgment, you must tell the American people the truth about what happens when a nuclear weapon is detonated. And when you tell them the truth, some people are going to be frightened. I'm frightened when I think about it myself. But I believe in the sound -- and I believe it's tried and true democratic principle -- that in those matters that involve the public, the public can be depended upon to take the action that is necessary if you give them the plain, unvarnished facts.

REP. FLOOD: Of course, that is all very interesting, Governor, but that's only half the ball game. Whether you think they are scared to death or not, I'm pretty close to them and they are scared to death. The important thing is if we admit they are only half scared they do not, in the opinion of some of us, have any instructions or confidence. They want to be with you, Governor, like I do, but we don't think you're doing this in the right way. We don't say it's your fault. Somebody goofed. Maybe it's Congress -- maybe it's you -- maybe it's the President -- there is something the matter with this thing.

GOV. PETERSON: I couldn't agree with you at all on that, Congressman. I don't think anybody goofed. I don't think the Congress goofed -- I don't think the President goofed -- I don't think Civil Defense goofed at any level -- and I don't think the people have goofed. I would say to you that here is a problem that staggers the best brains that mankind has and there are no simple solutions to a problem of this magnitude.

MR. BACK: Are we talking about the whole problem or the matter of whether people are frightened or not?

GOV. PETERSON: I think we were talking about the whole problem.

REP. FLOOD: That's one very important phase of it. I think we're talking about the same thing, and to my amazement, in exactly the same way. We're not too far apart, it seems to me.

MAYOR WALZ: I don't believe we are either, but the people are scared, and when people become scared of something of this nature, something that is a little beyond their comprehension, they like to push it out of their minds because it is disagreeable to contemplate and go on, as the ostrich does, and put his head in the sand and try to disregard the disagreeable.

REP. FLOOD: Now, Mayor, let me tell you this: It's all right to talk about Uncle Sam, and he's going to take care of things, but if you fellows back in these cities, and if you Mayors think that somebody a thousand miles away from your home town, or a hundred miles away, is going to pull a rabbit out of a hat or wave a wand, and that you are going to be protected and everything is going to be all right, you better stop thinking about that. We'll do the best we can, but we're not going to perform miracles. I think the Governor will agree with that.



MR. BACK: Congressman, how did you propose to eliminate the fright?

REP. FLOOD: I don't hope to eliminate the fright. What I want to do is recognize that it exists -- not pretend that it doesn't exist -- and then try to alleviate that fright with instructions, because I think, with the Governor, once you know the state of mind that people possess, then you must deal with that state of mind. Tell them the truth, but also give them some kind of intelligent, established long-range plan. A long range -- not tomorrow -- for the next five to ten years.

GOV. PETERSON: As a matter of fact, the people have every right to be scared, and any intelligent individual should be scared when he lives in an age where you have weapons of the devastation, of the character that I explained very quickly and very factually at the beginning of my talk. When you have a weapon -- one weapon -- one bomb -- that will wipe out a city the size of New York City, completely obliterate it, a city that has taken mankind 300 years to build, or any other city in the world -- when you have a situation of that kind, you have a situation in which mankind, from a standpoint of destruction, has outstripped himself, to gain powers that require common-sense and intelligence and great care in handling power of that kind.

MR. BACK: What is the first step we ought to take to help the people who are frightened? A suggestion was made here that the whole law should be rewritten. In other words, a new approach made to civil defense.

REP. FLOOD: I think that's true, but don't you forget this: There are these three branches of the government, and it's the established fact that under all of these circumstances after five or six years of this thing laying an egg -- and that's all that's happened to it -- everybody believes in it but nothing has actually been successful. Now why doesn't the President, why doesn't the Administration, why doesn't my friend, whom I have just nominated for Secretary of Defense -- I just placed you in the Cabinet -- why don't these people come up to the Hill and say, "Now, gentlemen, you've been wrong and we're all wrong. Here is a well planned, intelligent program, looking into the years ahead of inter-continental ballistic missiles, the H-bomb, and this is what we think should be done. Let's try this. The other one was no good. Let's begin from here."

GOV. PETERSON: Mr. Congressman, I couldn't agree with you about the other not having been good. I tried to explain carefully in my opening statement that in the post-attack phase of civil defense, which we will always need, we have well-worked-out programs, the information has been well disseminated, and many of the cities and states have set up excellent organizations. We don't want to overlook the fact, when we point out our shortcomings, that an excellent job has been done in the United States in a wide area of civil defense. Now, in the pre-attack phase there are only two things that we can work with -- space and shelter. We have worked out a very careful scientific study in the city of Milwaukee. We have a request before the Congress for enough money to do it in every one of the 92 cities of the United States. The minute that we have that money we can proceed upon a logical basis.

REP. FLOOD: You have money coming out of your ears. You've had \$320 million in the last five years. It isn't that you need money. You get all the money you need. You don't know what to do with it when you get it. That's the trouble.

GOV. PETERSON: Oh, yes. We know exactly what to do with it, and we have been doing it. As a matter of fact, a committee of the Congress of the United States, only over in the Senate side, has been studying this problem rather carefully now for several months. I refer to the Kefauver subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, and I think they have pointed out that the Congress has been deficient in the amount of money that has been made available to us, but I am not one of those who believes that money will solve everything. There are other considerations more important.

REP. FLOOD: Mayor, what effect do you think this whole program -- and I think it's great, as the Governor has just pointed out, some things good have taken place -- what about the good that this program of yours will do as you have it set up, or anyplace, on civil local disasters. Is there any value for local disasters, as distinguished from cataclysmic national attack of an enemy?



MAYOR WALZ: My position has always been that under the charter of our city, we don't need any special legislation to do it. It's our problem to start with. If we don't have sufficient equipment, material and items to meet a disaster -- a natural disaster -- then it is our duty to call on the Governor to bring in the resources of the state to assist our community in meeting whatever natural disaster we are faced with. But I feel that on this matter of leadership in this field, in this problem, I think that it behooves Congress on both sides of the aisle to start showing some leadership there, because it has sat back and it hasn't come up with any plan it can add to, or implement.

REP. FLOOD: As far as the Civil Defense organization is concerned, we're not there at all. We're dead. We've been wiped out -- I don't know whether that's good or bad.

MR. BACK: The inter-governmental commission suggested that the emphasis is wrong, putting the responsibility on the state and locally. Mr. Peterson, have you given any thought to that.

GOV. PETERSON: Yes, as a matter of fact, I came down here in 1950 representing the Governor's Conference to help advise the Congressional committee that was writing this law. I came down here with the Governor of Ohio and then I helped set up civil defense in my own state, and since then, I have been down here and had this responsibility in Washington, so I have thought a good deal about it and am thinking about it constantly. I think when the law says that civil defense is primarily the responsibility of the states and localities, I think the law is unfortunate in that respect. I think that we should make this a joint responsibility. I think we must always maintain the interest and enthusiasm and the abilities that only the cities and the states can exercise in the event of an attack. But I believe the federal government must exercise greater authority and assume greater responsibility than it has in the past.

REP. FLOOD: I will buy that -- there is a great deal to that -- but I want to point out that what you mean by federal responsibility under the amended organic act or as it exists today -- it must be narrow, we can't go too far -- and I think that federal civil defense, even under the amended act in whatever form, must put its biggest effort into development of a large, technically trained professional planning staff which could conduct these operation studies and create believable, understandable long-range plans. This must be primarily that kind of thing. What the British or the Germans did, or what they are doing now, has nothing to do with the case, tra-la.

MAYOR WALZ: What I think we are doing is confusing certain phases of the problem. One is responsibility -- the other is authority -- and the other is financing. Generally, when we talk of civil defense, we group the three together and we say we can't separate any of the three to arrive at a proper solution of the problem, but I feel that we can. On this question of authority, Congress, except by a constitutional amendment, can't be given any authority over the operation of the states and their local fields, but that. . . .

REP. FLOOD: There's military martial law. That's the end of that question right there.

MAYOR WALZ: That's true. As a matter of fact, I was quite surprised, and it was one of the points that I had in mind when I mentioned the confusion that exists in some of the departments. On this last test -- Operation Alert -- there was an order or a proclamation put out for declaration of martial law. I had always been led to believe that the military had disclaimed any responsibility for civil defense, and if they are going to disclaim any responsibility for civil defense, I can't see the need for martial law.

REP. FLOOD: I think Val Peterson was as surprised as you were. So was everybody else.

GOV. PETERSON: On this whole business of martial law, the President declared it in this situation that faced us the other day because of the magnitude of the problems that were caused by the attack on 58 American cities. The problems were simply unbelievable in magnitude. Think of 25 million Americans homeless -- just think of that for a moment -- what that means in terms of feeding them and sheltering them and maintaining law and order and sanitation and health and that sort of thing.



REP. FLOOD: I don't object to the declaration of martial law. What I mean is, the civil defense organization, your organization, has had no analysis made; you have no answers; you haven't any answers as to how far martial law will go, how long it will stay on. I don't think in any place civil defense even thought about martial law. If they did, they told nobody about it and you should have told us about it. It scared us to death again.

GOV. PETERSON: I would say that in this particular field, Governor Caldwell, who was my predecessor and a distinguished member of the lower House of Congress for ten years. . . .

REP. FLOOD: Not the lower House -- don't say that -- never, never say the lower House. If Sam Rayburn ever heard you say that, Val, there would be trouble.

GOV. PETERSON: Well, at any rate, the House of Representatives did have a study made of martial law in the United States -- a very scholarly study that was made way back in 1950 or 1951. However, the constantly developing bigger weapons is what caused this thing to be done the other day, and I can just say to you that there is no one in America that wants to see martial law in this country any less than Dwight Eisenhower, the President of the United States, who approaches this thing strictly from a civilian standpoint. And in that declaration that he made the other day, it said specifically that it would be the duty of the military to back up civil defense and the other civilian agencies in maintaining law and order.

REP. FLOOD: There must be coordination, as I said in my original opening statement. There must be coordination between your department of Civil Defense and between the military, and it should be your job to be the coordinator because if and when, God forbid, this happens, you have to work with them. No question about it.

GOV. PETERSON: That's exactly the thing that we're working toward. As a matter of fact, we've had a number of meetings over this very problem -- are working with it now. This is a problem of some magnitude and I believe that as time goes by we're going to be able to come up with solutions, but bear in mind that we're plowing absolutely virgin ground here.

MR. BACK: I want to turn now to the winner this week of the American Peoples Encyclopedia. The winner is B. F. McLain of Dallas, Texas, who submitted this question: "What effect will an evacuation have on our industrial production -- specifically, how can the home front function if the population of principal cities is evacuated frequently?" Mr. Peterson, will you take that?

GOV. PETERSON: The philosophy back of that question is based on world war thinking. It is based on the idea of the blockbusters time, when you could keep people at their lathes and keep them working in spite of the fact that the bombs were dropping on them. That happened in Germany and that happened in England. However, when you're dealing with nuclear weapons of the million ton class, you simply cannot stay at your lathe, you cannot stay in your town, you're going to have your cities completely destroyed if the bombs fall, and so we can't worry about production during that period of the attack. As a matter of fact, there are some people in America who believe that in a possible World War III you will win with the inventory you have on hand that day, and that you won't get restored production for months following an attack upon the country. Now, that depends upon the success of the enemy and the magnitude of the attack.

MR. BACK: Thank you, Mr. Peterson. I want to turn to our audience here in Washington, D. C.

QUESTIONER: Governor Peterson, will a greater degree of international understanding coming possibly out of the summit conferences at Geneva, tend to slow down civilian defense efforts?

GOV. PETERSON: I think it will and I offer you this example. The British people are sold, individually and collectively, on civil defense. They saw it save lives and property in the last war, but yet when I was there in September, 1953, studying it, they told me they had a very, very difficult time getting anybody to volunteer because their people wanted to go fishing and playing golf and out to the races and the ball games,



just like everybody else. It will be tough. Remember that the American military -- 170 and some years old -- between World War I and World War II declined to somewhere in the neighborhood of 150,000 men or less, and you could hardly get the Congress of the United States to appropriate money, even for the military, between World War I and World War II.

QUESTIONER: Congressman Flood, do you think that the overall attitude of the Congress, as reflected in the rather small amount appropriated for the civilian defense program, is a fair sample of the national attitude toward the potential danger?

REP. FLOOD: The American Congress -- the average Congressman -- is a perfect cross section of the people of the United States, no better and no worse, and he's no smarter and no dumber. He's the average American, and we think the way the people do. In 1951, I want you to know that civil defense asked the Appropriations Committee for 403 million dollars. In 1952, for 535 million. In 1953, for 600 million. Now they've come down to 85 million. There was no possible way or effort made to justify such a fantastic figure. Let me show you the analogy -- when the military, the defense people, come before the Appropriations Committee and the Congress, House and Senate, and they justify what they want, then they get the money and not until then. And as soon as the Civil Defense assume that burden, we'll meet it the same way.

GOV. PETERSON: I just want to say one thing, Congressman Flood, and that is that you impeach a very distinguished former colleague of yours, who served for ten years in the Congress of the United States, who was on the Appropriations Committee for many of those years, was a former two-term Governor of Florida who asked for those large sums of money that you just read and who asked for them principally to build shelters in the United States.

REP. FLOOD: I don't care who asks for them. This isn't a question of whether he's a Republican or a Democrat or a Governor of Florida or Governor of Pennsylvania-- it doesn't make a bit of difference -- and I'm telling you those figures could not be justified by anybody, including a Democratic Governor. That's going pretty far. They can justify most anything.

GOV. PETERSON: I'm simply pointing out that he had served on the House Appropriations Committee and should have been thoroughly familiar with the manner in which you justify a report to the Congress.

QUESTIONER: Mayor Walz, have you attended the conferences for Mayors on civil defense and have the Mayors taken any concerted action in the way of recommendations for our protection and for civil defense?

MAYOR WALZ: In answer to your question, I can make it specific with respect to the City of Wilmington, in this way. Within the past two months, the Governors of Pennsylvania, Delaware and New Jersey, Governors Leader, Boggs and Meyner, had a meeting along with Mayor Clark of Philadelphia and Mayor Brunner of Camden and myself representing the City of Wilmington, with a view to coordinating the plan, or studying a plan, setting up a plan for evacuation of that heavily settled metropolitan area which, as Governor Peterson has just pointed out, included 39 different municipalities of 10,000 or more population. Work is continuing on that plan. Where we are bogged down is finding the necessary funds to implement the study and to secure the facts on which any sound plan for evacuation of necessity must be based.

MR. BACK: I see in our audience here an old friend of TOWN MEETING, one who has participated in some of these broadcasts, James L. Wick, the executive publisher of "Human Events" who just a few months ago took a group of editors to Russia and behind the Iron Curtain. I'm looking forward to your question, Mr. Wick.

MR. WICK: Governor Peterson, in Europe most people ridicule our air raid drills in this day of the H-bomb. How do you account for the difference between the attitude of Europe and the United States towards civil defense?

GOV. PETERSON: Of course, I am not familiar with the ridicule of our tests here in the United States. I have toured and studied civil defense in England, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Germany, and I found no ridicule of what we were trying to do in civil defense in the United States at all. If you mean by that, that some



people are not as concerned about the possibility of a third world war as we are in this country, that's another matter. That may be true. I found some feeling of that type in Europe when I went through that area. However, there is one tremendous difference between the approach to civil defense in Europe and in the United States. In the United States and in Canada, we are expecting to evacuate and to take advantage of the tremendous amount of space that we have and the distance that we have between us and Russia. In the European countries, they simply are going to have to take shelter because, in many instances, they are only 8 or 10 or 12 minutes from the nearest Russian airbase. Take, for instance, Stockholm. It is 12 minutes from the nearest Russian airbase by bomber time. Copenhagen is 8 minutes. All you can do in those countries is duck under the table or get down in the basement or down in the cellar. However, Sweden, right now, is going from a tremendous shelter program to evacuation. Of course, there are two kinds of evacuation -- strategic that you take in advance, and tactical that you take after you know that the bombers are on the way. They're using both of them as we will have to use both.

REP. FLOOD: May I point this out, my friend. This business of bombers and evacuation is all very interesting if the thing is going to happen tomorrow morning, but if it is going to happen in five years from now and you have inter-continental ballistic missiles, evacuation is an academic problem. It's dropped -- and quick -- there will be no warning from anybody.

GOV. PETERSON: The only thing you can do then, if we get into the era of inter-continental ballistic missiles. . . .

MR. BACK: What is that missile, by the way?

REP. FLOOD: The inter-continental ballistic missile is on the boards and pretty well advanced, we believe. This missile will travel certainly in ranges up to 5,000 miles with A-warheads or H-warheads and will have all the effect of the most -- well, it's known as the ultimate weapon. Whatever you think the ultimate weapon is, that's what it is. If you've heard of Buck Rogers, you've heard of nothing, and we are talking of the inter-continental ballistic missile in the realm of five years.

GOV. PETERSON: It may go as far as 16,000 miles an hour. If it does that, it will be here in fifteen minutes. It may be possible that we can shoot them down on the way, that I don't know, but if they come there is no such thing as evacuation. There is hardly a chance to get shelter. All you can do then is disperse in advance and start digging in the ground.

MAYOR WALZ: Isn't it within the realm of possibility, even today, for guided missiles to be launched off our Atlantic coast from submarines.

GOV. PETERSON: Absolutely.

REP. FLOOD: Oh no, now just a minute. Not absolutely. That is possible, but it is not too probable just now.

QUESTIONER: Governor Peterson, the National Academy of Science reported here this spring in Washington that certain drugs had the preventative effect upon the radio fall-out. In other words, it protected mice against radioactive materials that are in the fall-out. I would like to know whether anything is being done along this line in the way of research that may be helpful towards human beings?

GOV. PETERSON: We are very interested in that problem. We have a medical section, as you know, and we've made delegations to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which works in the field of public health service. This as you understand it is a technical and a medical problem, and I don't know just exactly where we stand on it today, but I know we are interested in it and if that proves feasible for human beings, it would be very, very significant and very, very helpful.

REP. FLOOD: May I add to this. I don't like this idea of delegation of power to the Public Health Service. If they ever handle it the way they handled this vaccine for polio. . . .

QUESTIONER: We've always been under the impression that the Federal Civil Defense Act gave sufficiently broad authority to deal with most of the situations that might come up and most of the people that I've talked with in Civil Defense are pretty



much at a loss as to how this martial law will operate, how it will affect civil defense operations and whether or not the military have any plans for it?

REP. FLOOD: Of course, I don't know whether or not the military have any plans but they certainly should have. By the same token, I don't know whether or not the civil defense have any plans to coordinate with the military -- if and when martial law is placed in effect -- and my criticism, among other things, of the Civil Defense Administration is that I don't believe, I see no evidence, I've heard no evidence that they've ever given this question of martial law adequate research planning and have a program ready. They should have. I think martial law, if the cataclysm is of the nature that the Governor spoke of and I spoke of -- that we all think it will be -- the H-bomb the IBM-bomb then, of course, it will be martial law and if it is, what is civil defense planning and ready to do to coordinate with the military? So far, nothing, in my judgment. That's not good.

GOV. PETERSON: Civil Defense and the military have been working on this problem very assiduously for a period of months. You don't make public speeches about problems of this magnitude until you have studied them very carefully, unless sometimes you are a candidate for office.

REP. FLOOD: You know, part of the administration here is its cloud and dagger business, secrecy and censorship. Don't tell anybody anything. You may have a great idea, but if nobody knows about it, what good is it going to do?

GOV. PETERSON: Wait a minute, Mr. Congressman. If there is anybody who is guilty of secrecy and censorship, it's members of Congress and committees when they go into executive sessions and won't permit the newspapers to come in and the only way you get any information is leaks. I would say that the. . . .

REP. FLOOD: The only reason we do that is because we don't know what kind of information is going to come from the Civil Defense Agency downtown. . . .

QUESTIONER: Mayor Walz, in your field work in connection with civil defense, what do you find the condition and the attitude of the American people concerning the necessity for it?

MAYOR WALZ: I think in many of the services that cities attempt to establish, there is a reluctance on the part of the operation generally to participate. I feel that the backbone of any civil defense effort is going to be the personnel that is on the municipal payrolls and who constitute the municipal services that are now being furnished, implemented and supplemented by other personnel in the form of volunteer fire fighting and police personnel, and the operators of work corps working with our street and sewer departments and other construction sections of municipal government. One of the fields in which I find that there is considerable reluctance for people to volunteer is in the warden service. It seems that they were brought under some pale during the last war and have indicated reluctance to participate in the warden service.

QUESTIONER: Governor Peterson, to what extent has the concept of city-wide evacuation outmoded the old organization and training setup for civil defense volunteers and I refer specifically to the block warden, the sector warden, the zone warden, the fire guards, and such.

GOV. PETERSON: It hasn't outmoded the need for the block warden at all. We need them as desperately as we ever needed them, we need fire fighters as desperately as we ever needed them. However, we may have to change the manner in which we use them because of the tremendous threat of radioactive fall-out and particularly in that immediately close area we may find that the area is denied to the fire fighters and we are going to have to modify and are modifying our fire fighting techniques, because of that reason.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Flood, is it not important that highway planning be directed toward civil defense dispersement and if so, what can be done to provide funds for this purpose and interest to highway people, from the federal government on down to the local community?

REP. FLOOD: I think you're absolutely right. The answer is Yes, you must have the development of highway program if you're going to develop dispersal evacuation and that should be part of the criteria and part of a dual use. When you're going to spend millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for the civil defense physical establishment, let's build something we can use at the same time like highways, underground garages, fire breaks, getting rid of stumps, etc.